REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested. No claims have been canceled or added. No new matter has been added.

Claim Rejections

Independent claims 1, 11, 27, 39, 42, 49 and 58 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Geiger et al, U.S. Patent no. 6,463,534 (hereinafter "Geiger"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections.

Applicant's invention relates to a method of validating a domain name associated with an attempted access to a network site on a wired network (e.g., the Internet) by a mobile device on a wireless network. A data structure, such as mapping table, is maintained on a gateway coupling the wireless network and the wired network. The data structure maps a set of domain names individually to one or more alternative domain names, and is used for purposes of domain name validation. Upon a user requesting contents of a site located on a secure server, validation is achieved if the data structure includes an entry which maps the user-entered domain name to the domain name included in a digital certificate transmitted by the secure server, even if the two domain names do not match.

Claim 1 recites:

1. A method comprising:
maintaining in a network node **a data structure that includes a set of domain names and at least one alternative domain name corresponding to**

each domain name from the set of domain names, the network node coupled to a wireless network and a wired network; and

using the data structure to validate a domain name associated with an attempted access to a network site on the wired network by a mobile device on the wireless network.
(emphasis added).

The above emphasized claim limitations essentially recite a data structure which maps a set of domain names individually to one or more alternative domain names and using the data structure to validate a domain name associated with an attempted access to a network site on a wired network by a mobile device on a wireless network. In contrast, Geiger does not teach or suggest such a data structure and using such a data structure for domain name validation.

Geiger discloses a method of conducting transactions in a wireless electronic commerce system (Geiger's abstract), not a method of validating a domain name associated with an attempted access to a network site on a wired network by a mobile device on a wireless network, as recited in claim 1. Geiger does not teach or suggest a data structure as recited in claim 1, and it certainly does not teach or suggest using such a data structure for domain name validation.

The Examiner alleges that Geiger's column 8 lines 28-45 and column 15 lines 18-45 teach or suggest the data structure as recited in claim 1 (Office Action, page 2). Column 8 lines 28-45 discuss "a database or list correlating wireless client IDs with licenses (or license certificates) for each client ID and content items (e.g. software products) associated with the licenses". The database or list, however, does not correlate one domain name to one or more alternative domain names, as recited in

claim 1. Column 15 lines 18-45 discuss directories organizing validating certificates, which does not teach or suggest a data structure mapping domain names.

The Examiner also alleges that Geiger's column 13 lines 14-22 teaches or suggests using the data structure recited in claim 1 to validate a domain name associated with an attempted access to a network site on a wired network by a mobile device on a wireless network (Office Action, page 2). Although Geiger, in column 13 lines 14-22, mentions checking the validity of a merchant server, it does not teach or suggest using a data structure recited in claim 1 to achieve the validation. In addition, column 13 lines 14-22 disclose a method allowing a mobile user to manually validate a merchant server by checking "a web site listing the status of domain merchants", instead of using a data structure recited such as claim 1 to validate a domain name.

Thus, because Geiger does not teach or suggest each and every elements of claim 1, claim 1 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Geiger.

Claim 11 recites:

> 11. A method comprising:
> obtaining a first domain name provided by a client;
> retrieving a second domain name from a digital certificate;
> comparing the first domain name and the second domain name; and
> **accessing a data structure if the first domain name and the second domain name do not match.**
> (emphasis added).

Geiger does not teach or suggest the above emphasized claim limitation, namely accessing a data structure if a first domain name, provided by a client, and the second domain name, retrieved from a digital certificate, do not match.

The Examiner alleges that column 18 lines 45-63 of Geiger teach or suggest the above emphasized claim limitation. The discussion of column 18 lines 45-63 discloses a wireless device which validates an attribute authority (e.g., a software or serve provider) by checking a digital certificate received from the attribute authority. It does not teach or suggest comparing a domain name provided by a client and a domain name retrieved from a digital certificate, and certainly does not teach or suggest accessing a data structure if the two domain names do not match, as recited in claim 11.

Because Geiger does not teach or suggest each and every element of claim 11, claim 11 and all claims which depend on it are patentable over Geiger.

Similarly, claims 27, 39, 42, 49 and 58 each essentially recite the similar claim limitation of accessing a data structure (or a mapping table) if a user specified domain name does not match a domain name retrieved from a digital certificate. Thus, claims 27, 39, 42, 49, 58 and all claims which depend on them are patentable over Geiger.

Dependent Claims

In view of the above remarks, a specific discussion of the dependent claims is considered to be unnecessary. Therefore, Applicants' silence regarding any dependent claim is not to be interpreted as agreement with, or acquiescence to, the rejection of such claim or as waiving any argument regarding that claim.

For the foregoing reasons, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly requested.

If any additional fee is required, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: 11/30/05

Jordan M. Becker
Reg. No. 39,602

Customer No. 26529
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030
(408) 720-8300